

1993

## Two Types of Quirky Subjects: Spanish Versus Icelandic

Pascual José Masullo

*Universidad Nacional del Comahue*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/nels>



Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Masullo, Pascual José (1993) "Two Types of Quirky Subjects: Spanish Versus Icelandic," *North East Linguistics Society*. Vol. 23 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/nels/vol23/iss2/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Linguistics Students Association (GLSA) at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in North East Linguistics Society by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@library.umass.edu](mailto:scholarworks@library.umass.edu).

## **TWO TYPES OF QUIRKY SUBJECTS: SPANISH VERSUS ICELANDIC\***

**Pascual José Masullo**

**Universidad Nacional del Comahue**

### **0. Introduction**

Icelandic has been shown to possess "quirky" subjects, i.e. non-nominative NPs in preverbal position which display the full array of behavioral properties associated with canonical subjects, even if they do not agree with the verb in phi features (Zaenen et. al. 1985, Freidin & Sprouse 1991, and references therein). The following examples taken from the cited literature illustrate the phenomenon in question:

- (1) Honum var hjálpað  
Him-DAT was helped  
'He was helped' (Zaenen et al., 1985, p. 442)
- (2) Hennar var saknað  
Her-GEN was missed  
'She was missed' (Zaenen et al., 1985, p. 446)
- (3) Mig vantar peninga  
Me-ACC lacks money-ACC  
'I lack money' (Freidin & Sprouse, 1991, p. 408)

Likewise, Belletti & Rizzi (1988) have argued that Italian (and Spanish) psych verb constructions (their third type, epitomized by *piacere* 'like') contain quirky dative NPs of sorts, on the basis of a number of properties to be discussed below. Examples from Spanish are given in (4) and (5):

- (4) A Marcos le gusta la música coral  
Mark-DAT CL likes choral music  
'Mark likes choral music'
- (5) A Marcos le interesa la danza moderna  
Mark-DAT CL interests modern dance  
'Mark is interested in modern dance'

The structure Belletti & Rizzi propose for this type of construction is outlined in (6). The psych verb is unaccusative (i.e. it does not select an external argument), and takes two VP-internal arguments, a theme and an experiencer prelinked to dative case in the lexicon, with the experiencer higher in the tree structure as a reflection of its status in the Thematic Hierarchy:

- (6) DS: [IP *e* [VP [V' V THEME] EXP]]  
SS: [IP EXP<sub>i</sub> [VP [V' V THEME] t<sub>i</sub>]]

Further support for this analysis, as well as an extension of it to other predicate types and non-nominative elements in preverbal position, is provided in Masullo (1992a). What is still in need of an explanation, however, is why Spanish quirky subjects, unlike their Icelandic relatives, seem to also evince features associated with topics and left-dislocated constituents. The aim of this paper is to propose an explanation of these differences in terms of the dual nature of Spec (IP) in Spanish, behaving like an argument position in some respects, and like a non-argument position in others. Before doing so, however, in the next two sections I provide a brief characterization of Spanish quirky subjects, as well as a description of their behavioral properties.

## 1. A characterization of Spanish quirky subjects

### 1.1. Overview

As is argued in Masullo (1992a), quirky datives are not an idiosyncratic property of psych verb constructions alone, but also occur with a wide range of other unaccusative verbs, as is illustrated in (7) below. Furthermore, accusative NPs, as well as locative (Torrego, 1989, etc.) and temporal expressions, can also have the status of quirky subjects in unaccusative constructions, as is shown in (8) through (12):

- (7) A Marcos se le cayó una piedra encima  
Mark-DAT CL CL fell a rock on top  
'A rock fell on top of Mark'
- (8) A Marcos lo aburren las telenovelas  
Mark-ACC CL bore soap operas  
'Mark is bored by/with soap operas'
- (9) A Marcos lo llaman por el apellido  
Mark-ACC CL call by the last name  
'They call Mark by his last name'
- (10) Por esta calle pasan muchos camiones  
By this street pass lots of trucks  
'Lots of trucks travel through this road'
- (11) Aquí se come muy bien  
Here CL eats very well  
'One eats very well here'
- (12) El viernes tendrá lugar una manifestación  
Friday will take place a demonstration  
'A demonstration will take place on Friday'

In all of the above cases, the quirky subject originates as an internal argument and then raises to the empty Spec (IP) position, since it is higher in the Thematic Hierarchy than the NP expressing the role of theme (if there is one), which will get nominative case by government from INFL by adjoining to VP, as in Koopman & Sportiche (1988, 1990), Contreras (1992), etc. It is precisely the possibility of nominative case assignment by canonical government from INFL which enables any VP-internal argument (including agents, of course) to move to Spec (IP). In a language like English or French, on the other hand, Spec (IP) is exclusively reserved for nominative NPs, since nominative case can only be assigned via spec-head agreement (Koopman & Sportiche, 1988, 1990). The following generalization captures the distribution of non-nominative subjects in Spanish:

*Generalization:*

Any predicate will allow a (referential) non-nominative subject in Spanish, so long as the predicate does not select an external argument, or, if it does, it has been dethematized, i.e. the external argument has incorporated either into INFL or into the verb. (Masullo, 1992b)

In the remainder of this section, I examine the properties that quirky subjects share with canonical subjects in Spanish. In section 2, I discuss a number of parameters that distinguish them from canonical subjects, as well as from quirky subjects in Icelandic.

### 1.2. Word order

One of the arguments adduced by Belletti & Rizzi in favor of their analysis of preverbal datives as quirky subjects is that, unlike genuine topics or left-dislocated constituents, they can naturally occur in embedded clauses:

- (13) Es una pena que a Marcos no le interese la música coral  
 It is a shame that Mark-DAT NEG CL interests choral music  
 'It is a shame that Mark is not interested in choral music'
- (14) ?? Es una pena que a Marcos el comité no le haya otorgado una beca  
 'It is a shame that to Mark the committee did not award a fellowship'

Likewise, in questions, non-nominative subjects have the same distribution as canonical subjects do, i.e. they tend to occur in postverbal position (see Masullo, 1992b, for details):

- (15) ¿Dónde/cuándo se le ocurrió esa idea a Marcos?  
 Where/when CL CL occurred that idea Mark-DAT  
 'Where/when did that idea occur to Mark?'
- (16) \*¿Dónde/cuándo a Marcos se le ocurrió esa idea?  
 Where/when Mark-DAT CL CL occur that idea?

### 1.3. Extraction and relativized minimality

Another difference pointed out by Belletti and Rizzi between quirky subjects and left-dislocated constituents is that, unlike the latter, the former are not barriers for extraction:

- (17) Este es el tipo de música que a Adriana le gusta más  
 This is the kind of music that Adriana-DAT CL likes most  
 'This is the kind of music that Adriana likes best'
- (18) ?? Este es el tipo de música que a Ana Marcos recomendó  
 ?? 'This is the kind of music that to Ann Mark recommended'

More generally, if non-nominative preverbal constituents in unaccusative constructions were topics, they should constitute relativized minimality barriers (Rizzi, 1990) for A' movement of an element past them. The relevant portion of Rizzi's definition of relativized minimality is given below:

Z is a typical potential antecedent-governor for Y, Y in an A' chain = Z is an A' specifier c-commanding Y (Rizzi, 1990, p. 26)

However, as the following grammatical sentences show, the underlined quirky subjects do not interfere with the Wh-movement of the theme argument in (19) or the time adjunct in (20):

- (19) ¿Que óperas<sub>i</sub> negó Marta t'<sub>i</sub> que a su esposo<sub>j</sub> le gustaran t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub>?  
 'What operas did Martha deny that her husband liked?'
- (20) ¿Cuándo<sub>i</sub> dijo Marta t'<sub>i</sub> que a Marcos<sub>j</sub> se le ocurrió esa idea t<sub>j</sub> t<sub>i</sub>?  
 'When<sub>i</sub> did Martha say that Mark thought of that idea t<sub>j</sub>?'

### 1.4. Quantification

Belletti & Rizzi also note that quirky datives, but not left-dislocated constituents, can be quantified expressions, as is illustrated by the sentences below:

- (21) A nadie le gusta la música coral en esta casa  
'Nobody likes choral music in this house'
- (22) \* A nadie, el comité le otorgará una beca  
'To nobody, the committee will award a fellowship'

They explain this contrast by claiming that after Quantifier Raising, the trace of the topic in (22) will occupy an A' position, a position where variables cannot be licensed. In (21), on the other hand, the trace left by QR occupies Spec (IP), an A position. A slightly modified explanation will be proposed in section 3.1 below in view of the dual nature of Spec (IP) as both an A and A' position.

### 1.5. Raising

Another respect in which non-nominative preverbal elements in unaccusative constructions pattern with canonical subjects is their ability to raise if they happen to originate within the complement of a raising predicate such as *parecer* 'seem', or *empezar* 'begin':

- (23) A Adriana<sub>i</sub> parece gustarle la música coral t<sub>i</sub>  
Adriana-DAT seems to likeCL choral music  
'Adriana seems to like choral music'
- (24) A Marcos<sub>i</sub> le empezó a interesar el ajedrez t<sub>i</sub>  
Mark-DAT CL began to interest chess  
'Mark began to become interested in chess'

### 1.6. Absolute constructions

One more regard in which quirky subjects differ from topics is that they are capable of taking a secondary predicate. In (25) the quirky dative is modified by an absolute construction. As (26) shows, a topic cannot be modified in the same way:

- (25) Una vez PRO<sub>i</sub> llegado a Seattle, a Marcos<sub>i</sub> le empezó a gustar la lluvia  
'Once he had arrived in Seattle, Mark began to like the rain'
- (26) \* PRO<sub>i</sub> Habiendo terminado sus tareas, a los niños<sub>i</sub>, la madre los llevó al parque  
\* 'PRO<sub>i</sub> Having finished their homework, the children<sub>i</sub>, their mother took them to the park'

A possible explanation for this fact is that elements in operator position (topics, for example) cannot take predicates.

### 1.7. Parasitic gaps

It is a well-known fact that A' movement, such as Wh-extraction, topicalization, and clitic-left dislocation in the sense of Cinque (1990), can license parasitic gaps, as (27) and (28) show:

- (27) ¿A quién<sub>i</sub> t<sub>i</sub> preocupa la situación del país t<sub>i</sub> sin desesperar e<sub>i</sub>?  
'Who is worried about the country's situation without getting desperate?'

- (28) ? A Juan<sub>i</sub>, la situación del país lo preocupa *pro*<sub>i</sub> sin desesperar *e*<sub>i</sub>  
 'John, the situation of the country worries without despairing'

The movement of a VP-internal non-nominative argument to Spec (IP), however, is akin to A movement, since it cannot license a parasitic gap:

- (29) \* A Juan<sub>i</sub> lo preocupa la situación del país *t*<sub>i</sub> sin desesperar *e*<sub>i</sub>  
 John<sub>i</sub> CL worries the situation of the country *t*<sub>i</sub> without despairing *e*<sub>i</sub>

### 1.8. Weak crossover

Likewise, it is an established fact that A' movement induces weak crossover effects. If the analysis of non-nominative subjects adopted here is correct, we should expect movement of a VP-internal argument to an empty Spec (IP) position in unaccusative constructions not to induce weak crossover effects. This is hard to prove, however, since quirky datives, as well as quirky accusatives, necessitate clitic doubling, and, as first noted by Hurtado (1985), and later discussed by Suñer (1988), clitics do away with weak crossover effects:

- (30) ¿A quién<sub>i</sub> \*(lo) sorprende su<sub>i</sub> actitud *t*<sub>i</sub>?  
 Who<sub>i</sub> does his<sub>i</sub> attitude surprise *t*<sub>i</sub>?  
 (31.a) A Juan<sub>i</sub> le<sub>i</sub> gusta su<sub>i</sub> trabajo *t*<sub>i</sub>  
 John-DAT<sub>i</sub> CL<sub>i</sub> likes his<sub>i</sub> work *t*<sub>i</sub>  
 'John<sub>i</sub> likes his<sub>i</sub> work'

Nonetheless, in Italian, in which clitic doubling is disallowed, we see that displacement of the dative NP to preverbal position does not create a weak crossover effect, which is to be taken as evidence that it is an A rather than an A' movement operation:

- (31.b) A Giovanni<sub>i</sub> piace il suo<sub>i</sub> lavoro *t*<sub>i</sub>  
 John-DAT<sub>i</sub> likes his<sub>i</sub> work *t*<sub>i</sub>  
 'John<sub>i</sub> likes his<sub>i</sub> work'

### 1.9. Summary

To sum up, there is ample evidence which bears out our analysis of preverbal non-nominative elements in unaccusative constructions as occupying the Spec (IP) position, since they behave like subjects in a number of respects. In particular, the evidence discussed above suggests quite clearly that quirky subjects occupy an A, rather than an A' position, since, unlike topics and left-dislocated constituents, they can be quantified expressions, they cannot license parasitic gaps, they do not induce weak crossover effects, and they do not constitute barriers for Wh-movement. As we shall see in the next section, however, matters are not as clear-cut as they appear to be at first sight. On closer inspection, we see that quirky subjects in Spanish (and in Italian, for that matter) do not actually occupy a full-fledged argument position.

## 2. A' characteristics of Spanish quirky subjects

In contrast to quirky subjects in Icelandic, those encountered in Spanish cannot be represented by PRO, they cannot be deleted under identity with a nominative subject (and vice versa), and apparently they cannot bind anaphors, which require an A-binder. We turn to each one of these problems in the ensuing subsections:

### 2.1. Control

One of the arguments adduced by Zaenen et al. (1985) in favor of analyzing the preverbal constituents in Icelandic illustrated in (1) through (3) above as subjects rather than topics is that they can be represented by PRO, as the following sentences show. If quirky subjects occupied an A' position, this should not be possible, since PRO is standardly assumed to be licensed only as subject of a non-finite clause, clearly an A position.

- (32)    aðPRO batna veikin er venjulegt  
         PRO-DAT to recover from the disease-NOM is usual  
         (Freidin & Sprouse, 1991, p. 409)
- (33)    Eg vonast til að vanta ekki peninga  
         I hope for PRO-ACC to lack not money-ACC  
         'I hope not to lack money'
- (34)    að vanta peninga er alltof algengt  
         'To lack money is all too common'  
         (Zaenen et al., 1985, p. 454-5)

Although we have been able to establish that quirky subjects in Spanish seem to involve A rather than A' movement, the sentences below apparently contradict this claim, since PRO cannot be quirky in Spanish:

- (35)    \* Es difícil PRO-DAT gustarle las matemáticas  
         Is hard PRO-DAT likeCL mathematics  
         'It is hard for one to like mathematics'
- (36)    \* Yo<sub>i</sub> espero PRO<sub>i</sub> agradarme el concierto  
         'I hope to like the concert'

It might be countered that the above sentences are ungrammatical not because of the impossibility of PRO being quirky, but because the NPs expressing the theme cannot get nominative case in the embedded infinitival sentences in which they appear. However, in (37) below there is no NP that needs to be licensed by means of nominative case, and yet the sentence is ungrammatical. As I demonstrate in Masullo (1992b), the bare NP in (37) is licensed by incorporating into the light verb *dar* 'give':

- (37)    Es fácil PRO-DAT darle sueño en un concierto de este tipo  
         Is easy PRO-DAT giveCL sleep in a concert of this kind  
         'It is easy for one to doze off in this kind of concert'



## 2.2. *Subject ellipsis*

Yet another respect in which quirky subjects in Spanish differ from those found in Icelandic (see 38) is that they cannot be deleted under identity with a nominative subject and vice versa, as is shown in (41) and (42). Subject ellipsis is possible only under case identity (nominative in the case of (39), and dative in the case of (40)):

- (38) Hann segist vera duglegur, en \_\_\_\_finnst verkefnið of þungt  
He-NOM says-self to-be-diligent, but \_\_\_\_ (D) finds the homework too hard  
(Zaenen et al., 1985, p. 454)
- (39) Marcos<sub>i</sub> [ɪ' trabaja duro] pero e<sub>i</sub> [ɪ' gana poco dinero]  
'Mark<sub>i</sub> [ɪ' works hard] but e<sub>i</sub> [ɪ' earns very little money]
- (40) A Marcos<sub>i</sub> le gusta la música coral y e<sub>i</sub> le fascina la ópera  
Mark-DAT<sub>i</sub> likes choral music and e-DAT<sub>i</sub> fascinates opera  
'Mark likes choral music and is fascinated by opera'
- (41) \* Lidia<sub>i</sub> ama la poesía y e<sub>i</sub> le gustan las matemáticas  
Lidia-NOM<sub>i</sub> loves poetry and e-DAT<sub>i</sub> like mathematics-NOM  
'Lidia loves poetry and likes mathematics'
- (42) \* Marcos<sub>i</sub> es un gran músico y e<sub>i</sub> le fascina la ópera  
Mark-NOM<sub>i</sub> is a great musician and e-DAT<sub>i</sub> fascinates opera  
'Mark is a great musician and is fascinated by opera'

In this regard, then, quirky subjects pattern with topics, which do not license deletion of a nominative subject:

- (43) \* A Marcos<sub>i</sub>, Marta le dio un libro y e<sub>i</sub> se puso contento  
\* Mark<sub>i</sub>, Martha gave him a book and e<sub>i</sub> became happy

## 2.3. *Anaphor-binding*

One more characteristic discussed by Zaenen et al. (1985) which quirky subjects in Icelandic share with canonical nominative subjects is the fact that they can be binders for anaphors, as shown in (44) below:

- (44) Hverjum þykir sinn fugl fagur (Proverb)  
Everyone-DAT thinks his-REFL bird-NOM beautiful  
(Zaenen et al., 1985, p. 450)

In Spanish, however, quirky subjects do not seem to be able to bind anaphors, as we can gather from the following sentences:

- (45) \* A Adriana le gusta sí/ella misma  
Adriana-DAT CL likes herself  
'Adriana likes herself'
- (46) \* A Marcos lo preocupa sí/él mismo  
Mark-ACC CL worries himself  
\* 'Mark worries himself'

Nonetheless, pending further evidence, whether quirky subjects in Spanish can bind anaphors or not is an unsettled question, since (45) and (46) above will be ruled out in any case as a violation of Rizzi's (1986) condition on chains, very much like the passive sentence below, as Baker et al. (1989) argue:

- (47) \* Marcos<sub>i</sub> fue atacado<sub>i</sub> t<sub>i</sub> por sí mismo<sub>i</sub>  
'Mark was attacked by himself'  
(48) \* A Adriana<sub>i</sub> le gusta ella misma<sub>i</sub> t<sub>i</sub>  
'Adriana likes herself'

#### 2.4. Summary

Although the initial evidence we examined led us to conclude that quirky subjects occupy a full-blown A position, the data analyzed in the previous subsections seem to lead to exactly the opposite conclusion, viz. that quirky subjects occupy an A' position instead, since, like topics, they cannot be represented by PRO, they do not license subject ellipsis, and, arguably, cannot bind anaphors. As I try to demonstrate in the following section, this apparent contradiction stems from the dual nature of Spec (IP) in Spanish.

### 3. An explanation

#### 3.1. The dual nature of Spec (IP) in Spanish

In Chomsky (1981), Spec (IP) is an A position, since it is a potential theta position. With the advent of the VP-internal subject hypothesis, however, a redefinition of what constitutes an A position is certainly called for, since Spec (IP) is no longer a potential theta position (Mahajan 1990, etc.). The A/A' distinction is still being debated in GB theory (Depréz 1989, Chomsky 1991, etc.), but let us assume that an A' position typically involves operator movement into it, and that an A position is either a theta or a potential case position. By this definition, Spec (IP) in a language like English still qualifies as an A position, since it is here that nominative case is canonically assigned via spec-head agreement. Spec (IP) in Spanish, on the other hand, is not a full-fledged A position, since it is neither a theta nor a case position: nominative case is canonically assigned via government by INFL (Koopman & Sportiche 1988, 1990, Contreras 1992, etc.). Proof of this is the fact that, as is well-known, Spanish does not possess expletive pronouns (49), and allows V1 constructions, for example in presentational sentences (50). In this respect, Spec (IP) is somewhat of an A' position too.

- (49) Es imposible decifrar estos caracteres  
Is impossible to decipher these characters  
'It is impossible to decipher these characters'  
(50) Acaban de llegar huéspedes  
Have just arrived guests

The facts about Spec (IP) in Spanish discussed in the preceding paragraph are summarized below:

Spec (IP) can function as an A' position (more specifically, a [-case], [-theta] position), only if nominative case is canonically assigned via government by INFL in the sense of Koopman & Sportiche (1988, 1990), and others

We can reformulate the above generalization in terms of Contreras's (1992) views on the nominative case assignment parameter:

Spec (IP) can function as an A' position (more specifically, a [-case], [-theta] position), only if AGR is [+lexical]

From the above considerations, it follows that the A/A' distinction is actually derivative and reducible to more primitive features, such as [theta], [case], and [operator]. Such a reduction of the A/A' distinction, coupled with our observation that non-nominative subjects in Spanish occupy a [-case, -theta, -operator] position, allows us to explain why quirky subjects sometimes pattern with nominative subjects, while they sometimes behave like left-dislocated constituents. To the extent that they occupy a [-operator] position, they behave like true subjects. Thus, they can take on secondary predicates like absolute constructions, they can be quantified elements, they naturally occur in embedded clauses, and they can raise from an embedded clause to Spec (IP) of the main clause. Likewise, they do not constitute barriers for Wh-movement, they do not license parasitic gaps, and they do not induce weak crossover effects. However, to the extent that they occupy a [-case, theta] position, they cannot be represented by PRO, they cannot participate in I'-coordination with a nominative subject (or, for that matter, with a quirky subject bearing a different case), and, possibly, they cannot bind anaphors.

### 3.2. *Spec (IP) in Icelandic*

In Icelandic, on the other hand, Spec (IP) is a full-blown A position, in the standard sense. As in Spanish, it is [-operator], which accounts for the differences between quirky subjects and true topics in Icelandic discussed by Zaenen et al. (1985), as well as for similarities with their Spanish relatives. However, it is also a [+case] position, since nominative case is canonically assigned via spec-head agreement (Sigurðsson 1991, Vikner 1990), a consequence of which is the fact that Icelandic possesses expletive pronouns (see 51 and 52), which, by the way, can sometimes form a chain with a potential quirky subject in situ (53):

- (51) það hafa komið gestir  
It/there have arrived guests
- (52) það er ómögulegt að vinna þetta verk  
'It is impossible to do this work' (H. Thráinsson, p.c.)
- (53) Það var hjálpað barni  
It was helped a child-DAT  
'A child was helped'

(Freidin & Sprouse, 1991, p. 405)

The differences we have noticed in section 2 between quirky subjects in the languages under consideration find a natural explanation in terms of the [+case] nature of Spec (IP) in Icelandic: being in a full-blown A position, a quirky subject will be capable of binding an anaphor; PRO, standardly assumed to be licensed in A positions, can therefore afford to be quirky; likewise, subject ellipsis will be possible if one of the subjects is canonical and the other is quirky, since, for the purposes of I' coordination it is the nominative case underlying the lexically specified case of the quirky subject that counts. To fully understand how subject ellipsis is licensed in these cases, we must first discuss one more crucial difference between Icelandic and Spanish, viz. the existence of idiosyncratic lexical case in the former (Freidin & Sprouse 1991, etc.), as opposed to the latter. We turn to this distinctive feature of Icelandic in the next subsection.

### 3.3. *Lexical case phenomena*

It seems to be an uncontroversial fact that quirky subjects in Icelandic result from a lexically case-marked NP overriding the structural case that would otherwise be assigned in a particular position (Freidin & Sprouse 1991), in accordance with Freidin & Babby's Principle of Lexical Satisfaction, stated below:

*Principle of Lexical Satisfaction:*

Lexical properties must be satisfied (Freidin & Babby, 1984)

Thus, in the Icelandic examples of quirky subjects given in (1) through (3) in the introduction, the NPs which have moved to Spec (IP) must have dative, genitive and accusative case respectively, by virtue of being selected by verbs that idiosyncratically assign these cases. Notice that lexical case in Icelandic will not only override the structural nominative case canonically assigned in Spec (IP), but it will also override the structural accusative case assigned in ECM contexts, as is shown in (54) below:

- (54) Eg tel henni hafa alltaf þótt Olafur leiðinlegur  
 I believe her-DAT to have always thought Olaf-NOM boring  
 (Zaenen et al., op. cit., p. 449)

In contrast, Spanish quirky subjects are not lexically specified<sup>1</sup>, and consequently do not override the structural case that would normally be assigned in a particular position, whether nominative or accusative. If we assume that perception verbs such as *ver* 'see' subcategorize for an infinitival clause whose subject gets structural accusative case under ECM, we can easily prove our point. In (55), the subject of the embedded clause is the argument expressing the role of theme, which gets accusative case from *ver*. (56) is the counterpart to (55), in which the subject is the dative NP expressing a locative. While this order (with a quirky dative) is quite normal in main clauses, it is not possible in an embedded context, since the structural accusative case assigned by the main clause verb cannot be overridden:

- (55) Vi [la piedra caérsele encima a Marcos]  
 'I saw the stone fall on top of Mark'  
 (56) \* Vi [a Marcos caérsele la piedra encima]

True enough, (56) is also ruled out because the NP *la piedra* cannot get any kind of case in this position. The same cannot be said of (57) below, however, since the determinerless NP *sueño* 'sleep' is licensed by incorporating into the light verb *dar* 'give' (Masullo, 1992b), indicating that the sentence is ungrammatical because the quirky subject in the embedded clause cannot suppress the structural accusative case discharged in the position to which it has moved:

- (57) \* Vi [a Marcos darle sueño]  
 I saw Mark-DAT giveCL sleep  
 'I saw that Mark was getting sleepy'

Another difference between the two types of quirky subjects under consideration, which is a byproduct of the existence of lexical case phenomena in Icelandic and the lack thereof in Spanish, is that in the first movement of a lexically case-marked NP to a structural case position is motivated by the Case Licensing Principle, stated below:

*Case Licensing Principle:*

A lexical NP (that is, one containing phonetic material) must occur in a case-licensed position (Freidin & Sprouse, 1991, p. 410)

As Freidin and Sprouse (1991) argue, although an NP may bear the idiosyncratic case assigned by the verb that selects it, it still needs to be licensed in a structural case position. As we see in the contrastive pair below, (59) is ungrammatical even if the subject of the sentence bears its lexical case, since it cannot be licensed in an infinitival construction, where structural nominative case cannot be assigned:

- (58) að PRO batna veikin er venjulegt  
 PRO-DAT to recover from the disease-NOM is usual  
 (59) \* að Jóni batna veikin er mikilvagt  
 John-DAT to recover from the disease-NOM is important  
 (Freidin & Sprouse, 1991, p. 409)

Thus, the Case Licensing Principle will motivate the movement of a lexically case-marked NP to Spec (IP) in passive sentences, for example. The lexical marking cannot be erased, or else the Principle of Lexical Satisfaction will be violated. Nonetheless, the structural case underlying it will still be active in a number of ways, for instance, in licensing subject ellipsis (see 2.2 above), which can now be hypothesized to occur under identity of case *licensing*, rather than under identity of case *assignment*, as Heles Contreras (p.c.) points out. The present analysis predicts, then, that if Icelandic did not evince lexical case phenomena, it should not have quirky subjects either.

In Spanish, on the other hand, the (optional) movement of a non-nominative argument to Spec (IP) in unaccusative constructions does not take place in order to comply with the Case Licensing Principle, but arguably in order to satisfy predication (see Masullo, 1992b for details)<sup>2</sup>.

#### 4. Conclusion

Quirky subjects are not a unified phenomenon per se, but are rather a manifestation of independent principles of the core grammars of the languages in which they occur. In this paper I have argued that their existence and behavioral properties depend on factors such as lexical case phenomena, and the nature of Spec (IP), itself dependent on how nominative case is assigned, viz. via spec-head agreement or via canonical government from INFL. The analysis proposed here predicts that the properties of quirky subjects in the many languages that have been reported to have them should be a function of the factors mentioned above, and possibly others. Although a close examination of all these languages is certainly beyond the scope of the present paper, the analysis being advocated here seems to find confirmation in Russian. Russian is quite similar to Spanish in allowing preverbal non-nominative arguments in unaccusative constructions which display subject-like behavioral properties, as the sentences below show:

- (60) Mne (bylo) xolodno  
Me-DAT (was) cold  
'I am/was cold'
- (61) Sestre kazetsja, cto on durak  
Sister-DAT seems that he fool  
'It seems to my sister that he is a fool' (Irina Kominz, p.c.)

Russian is also like Spanish in not having expletive pronouns, an indication that nominative case is assigned via government by INFL. Crucially, as the sentences below bear witness to, Russian quirky subjects cannot be represented by PRO, nor can they delete under identity with a nominative subject in I' coordination. Likewise, they seem incapable of binding anaphors. These facts indicate that quirky subjects in Russian also occupy a mixed Spec (IP) position, i.e. [-operator] (A in the standard sense), but [-theta], and [-case] (A' in the standard sense)<sup>3</sup>.

- (62) \* PRO-DAT Byt' xolodno v Sibiri neveselo  
PRO-DAT be-INF cold in Siberia is no fun  
'It is no fun to be cold in Siberia'
- (63) \* Ivanu trebujutsja den'gi i mnogo rabotajet  
'Ivan needs money and works hard'
- (64) \* Ivanu nuzen seb'a  
Ivan-DAT needs self-GEN  
'Ivan needs himself' (Irina Kominz, p.c.)

## Notes

\* I would like to acknowledge the invaluable help provided by Heles Contreras, Michael Rochemont, H. Thráinsson, and Irina Kominz in the development of this paper.

1. See Masullo (1992b) for arguments that dative case is structural and completely predictable in Spanish, having none of the flavor associated with the lexically assigned case of quirky subjects in Icelandic. This holds true even of psych verb constructions of the *piacere* 'like' class discussed by Belletti & Rizzi (1988).
2. Hypothesizing that the movement in question is triggered by predication will explain, for example, why non-referential elements such as instrumentals do not occur as quirky subjects.
3. Russian also exhibits lexical case phenomena (Freidin & Sprouse, 1991). However, contrary to expectation, it does not have quirky subjects of the Icelandic type arising out of the need to comply with the Case Licensing Principle. A possible explanation is suggested by Freidin & Sprouse (1991), who argue that while in Icelandic passive morphology absorbs only structural case, in Russian it absorbs both structural and lexical case.

## References

- Baker, M., K. Johnson, and I. Roberts (1989) "Passive Arguments Raised", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20, 219-251.
- Belletti, A. & L. Rizzi (1988) "Psych Verbs and Theta Theory", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 6, 291-352.
- Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Foris.
- Chomsky, N. (1991) "Economy Considerations in Language Design", unpublished manuscript, MIT.
- Cinque, G. (1990) *Types of A-Bar Dependencies*. The MIT Press.
- Contreras, H. (1992) "On the Position of Subjects", in S. Rothstein (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics, vol. 25: Perspectives on Phrase Structure: Heads and Licensing*. Academic Press.
- Depréz, V. (1989) *On the Typology of Syntactic Positions and the Nature of Chains: Move Alpha to the Specifier of Functional Projections*, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Freidin, R. & L. Babby (1984) "On the Interaction of Lexical and Structural Properties: Case Structure in Russian", *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics* 6.

- Freidin, R. & R. Sprouse (1991) "Lexical Case Phenomena", in R. Freidin (ed.) *Principles and Parameters of Comparative Grammar*. The MIT Press.
- Hurtado, A. (1985) "The Unagreement Hypothesis", in L. King and C. Maley (eds.) *Selected Papers from the XIII Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*. John Benjamins.
- Koopman, H. & D. Sportiche (1988) "Subjects", unpublished manuscript, U.C.L.A.
- Koopman, H. & D. Sportiche (1990) "The Position of Subjects", unpublished manuscript, U.C.L.A.
- Mahajan, A. (1990) *The A/A-Bar Distinction and Movement Theory*, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Masullo, P. J. (1992a) "Quirky Datives in Spanish and the Non-Nominative Subject Parameter", paper presented at SCIL IV, Ohio State University, April 1992, published in *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*.
- Masullo, P. J. (1992b) *Incorporation and Case Theory in Spanish: A Crosslinguistic Perspective*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington.
- Rizzi, L. (1986) "On Chain Formation", in H. Borer (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics, vol. 19: The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics*. Academic Press.
- Rizzi, L. (1990) *Relativized Minimality*. The MIT Press.
- Sigurðsson, H. (1990) "V1 Declaratives and Verb Raising in Icelandic", in J. Maling & A. Zaenen (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics, vol 24: Topics in Icelandic Syntax*. Academic Press.
- Suñer, M. (1988) "The Role of Agreement in Clitic-Doubled Constructions", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 6, 391-434.
- Torrego, E. (1989) "Unergative-Unaccusative Alternations in Spanish", *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, 10, 253-272.
- Vikner, S. (1990) *Verb Movement and the Licensing of NP-Positions in the Germanic Languages*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Geneva.
- Zaenen, A., J. Maling, & H. Thráinsson (1985) "Case and Grammatical Functions: The Icelandic Passive", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 3, 441-483.